<div align="center">**REMARKS**</div>

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed January 5, 2007.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 82 – 105 remain pending. In particular,

Applicants amend claims 82, 95, 98, 100, 102, and 104. Reconsideration and allowance of the

application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I.   **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

    A.   **Claim 82 is Allowable Over *Lasky***

The Office Action indicates that claim 82 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as

allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*"). Applicants respectfully

traverse this rejection on the grounds that *Lasky* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the

claimed elements. More specifically, claim 82 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program
> information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> a memory configured for storing a first data and a second data,
> said first data including respective program information for a plurality of
> corresponding television programs, said second data different than the
> first data, said second data comprising a channel table that includes a
> plurality of assigned channel categories to television channels, wherein
> ***the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a***
> ***plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields***
> ***including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values,***
> ***wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category***
> ***and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category***
> ***assigned to the respective channels***; and
> a processor, coupled to the memory, the processor configured to
> simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table for data
> related to at least one channel to which a category is assigned and causing
> the display of at least one television program, the processor further
> configured to receive selection of a channel category and, in response to
> receiving selection of the channel category, provide program information
> associated with the at least one channel to which the selected channel
> category is assigned.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 82, as amended, is allowable over the cited art

for at least the reason that the *Lasky* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "[i]n a television

network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs…
wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 82, as amended. More specifically, *Lasky* appears to disclose a "program-guide database [that] contains a record for each <u>program</u>, and each record has information for its program in fields…" (<u>emphasis added</u>, column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs…
wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 82, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 82, as amended is allowable over *Lasky*.

      B.   <u>Claim 95 is Allowable Over *Lasky*</u>

      The Office Action indicates that claim 95 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Lasky*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that *Lasky* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, claim 95 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> an interface to the television network, said interface configured for receiving a first data and a second data, said first data including respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs, said second data comprising a channel table, wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a**

> *plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels*; and
>
> a processor, configured to simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table for data related to at least one channel to which a category is assigned and display at least one television program, the processor further configured to receive selection of a channel category and, in response to receiving selection of the channel category, provide program information associated with at least one channel to which the selected category is assigned.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 95, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the *Lasky* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 95, as amended. More specifically, *Lasky* appears to disclose a "program-guide database [that] contains a record for each <u>program</u>, and each record has information for its program in fields…" (<u>emphasis added</u>, column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 95, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 95 is allowable over *Lasky*.

C.   Claim 98 is Allowable Over *Lasky*

The Office Action indicates that claim 98 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Lasky*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that *Lasky* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, claim 98 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a channel table that includes respective associations of one or more channel categories for a plurality of corresponding television channels, wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**; and
> a processor, coupled to the memory, for causing the display of a browse banner on top of a portion of a first television program being displayed responsive to receiving an initial activation of a browse command, said browse banner comprising a first program information, said first program information corresponding to a second television program different than the first television program, wherein the processor causes the display of said browse banner on top of the first television program without providing the second television program, the processor further configured for simultaneously searching at least a portion of the channel table for data related to at least one channel to which a category is assigned and causing display at least one television program, said processor further configured to receive a selection of a channel category and, in response to receiving selection of the channel category, provide program information associated with at least one channel to which the selected category is assigned.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 98, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the *Lasky* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits**

with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels" as recited in claim 98, as amended. More specifically, *Lasky* appears to disclose a "program-guide database [that] contains a record for each <u>program</u>, and each record has information for its program in fields…" (<u>emphasis added</u>, column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 98, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 98, as amended, is allowable over *Lasky*.

       D.   <u>**Claim 100 is Allowable Over *Lasky***</u>

       The Office Action indicates that claim 100 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Lasky*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that *Lasky* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, claim 100 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel categories, each television channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**; and

a processor coupled to the memory, said processor configured to:

receive a user-selected television channel category, and

responsive to the receiving the user-selected television channel category, search at least a portion of the channel table and provide program information exclusively for television programs corresponding to television channels associated with the user-selected television channel category,

wherein the processor is configured for simultaneously searching at least a portion of the channel table and causing the display of at least one television program.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 100, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the *Lasky* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein ***the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***" as recited in claim 100, as amended. More specifically, *Lasky* appears to disclose a "program-guide database [that] contains a record for each <u>program</u>, and each record has information for its program in fields…" (<u>emphasis added</u>, column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein ***the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***" as recited in claim 100, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 100, as amended, is allowable over *Lasky*.

.

**E.   Claim 104 is Allowable Over *Lasky*

The Office Action indicates that claim 104 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as

allegedly being anticipated by *Lasky*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the

grounds that *Lasky* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More

specifically, claim 104 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program
> information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> a memory configured for storing respective program information
> for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a channel table
> that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel
> categories, each television channel category being associated with a
> corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein ***the channel
> table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of
> respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including
> a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at
> least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and
> wherein the respective values indicate at least one category
> assigned to the respective channels***; and
> a processor, coupled to the memory, said processor configured to
> simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table and cause
> display of at least one television program, the processor further configured
> to receive selection of a channel category and provide program information
> associated with at least one channel to which the selected channel
> category is assigned.
> ***(emphasis added)***

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 104, as amended, is allowable over the cited art

for at least the reason that the *Lasky* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "[i]n a television

network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs…

wherein ***the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of

respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits

with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a

predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one

category assigned to the respective channels***" as recited in claim 104, as amended. More

specifically, *Lasky* appears to disclose a "program-guide database [that] contains a record for each <u>program</u>, and each record has information for its program in fields…" (<u>emphasis added</u>, column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 104, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 104, as amended, is allowable over *Lasky*.

      F.   <u>**Claims 83 – 92, 94, and 97 are Allowable Over *Lasky***</u>

The Office Action indicates that claims 83 – 92, 94, and 97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Lasky*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that *Lasky* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, dependent claims 83 – 92 and 94 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 82. Dependent claim 97 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 95. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

II.   <u>**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**</u>

      A.   <u>**Claim 93 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Amano***</u>

The Office Action indicates that claim 93 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lasky* in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,585,865 ("*Amano*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Amano* fails to

disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 93. More specifically, dependent claim

93 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable

independent claim 82.

       B.   **Claim 102 is Allowable Over _Lasky_ further in view of _Yuen_**

       The Office Action indicates that claim 102 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over _Lasky_ further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,673,089 ("_Yuen_").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that the proposed

combination of _Lasky_ in view of _Yuen_ fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of

claim 102. More specifically, claim 102 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> an interface for receiving data from the television network, said interface being capable of receiving a first data and a second data, said first data including respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs, said second data comprising a channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of channel categories, each channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, said plurality of categories including a first category; and
> processor configured to:
> receive a first user input corresponding to the assignment of the first channel category to a first television channel,
> responsive to the receiving the first user input, store the association of the first channel category and the first television channel in the memory,
> receive a second user input corresponding to the first channel category,
> responsive to the receiving the second user input, simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table and cause the display of at least one television program,
> receive third user input corresponding to selection of a channel category, and
> responsive to receiving the third user input, providing program information associated with at least one channel to which the selected channel category is assigned,
> wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a**

***predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate
at least one category assigned to the respective channels***.
(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 102, as amended is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the *Lasky* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 102, as amended. More specifically, *Lasky* appears to disclose a "program-guide database [that] contains a record for each <u>program</u>, and each record has information for its program in fields…" (column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 102, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 102 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, *Yuen* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky*. More specifically, *Yuen* appears to disclose a "channel numbers [that] are stored under each [theme] key" (column 5, line 60). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "[i]n a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs… wherein **the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective**

bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels" as recited in claim 102, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 102 is allowable over the cited art.

       C.   **Claims 96, 99, 101, 103, and 105 are Allowable Over _Lasky_ further in view of _Yuen_**

The Office Action indicates that claims 96, 99, 101, 103, and 105 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over _Lasky_ further in view of _Yuen_. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that _Lasky_ further in view of _Yuen_ fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 96, 99, 101, 103, and 105. More specifically, dependent claim 96 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 95. Dependent claim 99 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 98. Dependent claim 101 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 100. Dependent claim 103 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 102. Further, dependent claim 105 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 104.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_____ /afb/ _____
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
  HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500